

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 remain pending, no claims having been amended, canceled or added.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24**

On page 2 of the Final Office Action of May 25, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 14-18 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,789,060 to Wolfe et al. (“Wolfe”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,060 to Schrage. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for processing voicemail messages. The method includes, among other things, receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, the at least one selection action identifying a portion of one or more voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action of May 25, 2006, the Examiner admitted that Wolfe does not specifically disclose or suggest identifying a portion of the voicemail message transcript for delivery. Applicants agree. Further, Applicants wish to point out that Wolfe also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleged that claim 1 of Schrage discloses or suggests delivering at least a portion of a generated transcript. However, Applicants submit that Schrage also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a

portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1.

Schrage discloses a recording an automated transcription method and system in which telephone conference calls may be recorded and automatically transcribed (see Abstract). Each speaker's voice may be separately recorded and time stamped (Schrage, Abstract, lines 13-14). The separate recordings may be collated to form a master transcript of textual data (Schrage, Abstract, lines 18-21). According to Schrage, at steps 424-426 of Fig. 4B and col. 7, lines 6-21, after generating a transcript from recorded speech, the transcription system determines whether a composite transcript is to be produced. The system can make the determination by checking whether the recording includes a conference ID, indicating that the transcript is part of a conference (see Schrage, at col. 7, lines 8-11). If the transcript is part of a conference, then a composite transcript is produced by combining transcripts from multiple users who participated in the conference (see Schrage, at col. 7, lines 12-21).

Applicants wish to point out that Schrage is completely silent with respect to any disclosure or suggestion of receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1. Instead Schrage discloses that the system determines whether a transcript will be produced from a single recording of one user or whether a composite transcript from recordings of multiple users will be produced based on whether the recording is from a conference call. Applicants submit that this feature is not equivalent to receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicants submit that neither Wolfe nor Schrage disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, the above-mentioned feature

required by claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and claims 3, 6 and 7, which depend from claim 1 directly or as a base claim, be withdrawn.

Independent claims 8, 16 and 21 recite features similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore patentable over Wolfe and Schrage for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 8, 16 and 21, as well as claims 9-11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 22-24, which depend from one of claims 8, 16, or 21, either directly or as a base claim.

Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentable for reasons of their own. For example, claim 3, which depends from claim 1, further recites that the identified portion of the one or more voicemail message transcripts includes a plurality of non-contiguous portions of the one or more voicemail message transcripts. On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Wolfe fails to disclose or suggest that the selected portion of the one or more voicemail message transcripts includes a plurality of non-contiguous portions of one or more voicemail message transcripts. The Examiner alleged that claim 1 of Schrage discloses or suggests transmitting at least a portion of the transcript including multiple non-contiguous portions. Applicants disagree.

Applicants submit that claim 1 of Schrage discloses delivering at least a first portion of a generated first transcript. However, claim 1 of Schrage is completely silent with respect to whether the at least a first portion of the generated first transcript has or does not have non-contiguous portions.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage. Further, claims 11, 18 and 22 recite features similar to those of claim 3 and are patentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 3.

**Rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 20**

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,041 to Reynar et al. (“Reynar”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,775,360 to Davidson et al. (“Davidson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Similarly, claim 20 depends from claim 16, which is patentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Applicants submit that Reynar and Davidson fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Schrage. In particular Reynar and Davidson, either separately or on combination with Wolfe and Schrage, also fail to disclose or suggest receiving at least one selection action from one or more users, wherein the at least one selection action identifies a portion of one or more of the voicemail message transcripts for delivery to one or more parties identified by the one or more users, as required by claim 1 and as similarly required by claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2, 5 and 20 be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 4, 7, 12 and 13**

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Schrage and further in view of Davidson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim, and are patentable over Wolfe and Schrage for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 8, either directly or as a base claim, and are patentable over Wolfe and Schrage for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 8. Applicants

submit that Davidson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Wolfe and Schrage. Therefore,  
Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 7, 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject  
application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 25, 2006

By: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address:

AT&T Corp.  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,499  
Phone: 410-286-9405  
Fax No.: 410-510-1433